

Remarks

Claims 47-51, 53, 54, 56-58, 60, 62-64, 66 and 68-71 are pending in the application. Claims 47, 57, and 63 have been amended. Claims 69-71 have been added herewith. Support for the amendment to the specification at paragraph [0064.02] can be found at least at U.S. Patent Application 5,743,743, col. 3, lines 15-18 and col. 4, lines 30-35, from which this application claims priority and which was incorporated by reference into the specification. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Clarification

Applicants appreciate the quick response by Supervisory Patent Examiner Bumgarner in resolving an ambiguity. Following the Examiner's recommendation, Applicants have submitted the accompanied RCE.

Objection to the Drawings

In the Office action, Fig. 9 was objected to for incorporating new matter. The Advisory Action indicated the objection was not overcome. Specifically, the Office action objected to the addition of structure with the statement, "computer with storage." This objection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons provided in the Prior Response, in addition to the following reasons.

It is not uncommon to define a computer to include storage. For example, the Wikipedia definition of computer states "Conventionally a computer consists of some form of memory for data storage...."

Applicants' specification at [0064.02] recites, "[d]ifferent components of the present invention can be in different elements." Further, to prevent any possibility of ambiguity, Applicants have added the language, "[n]onetheless, there is no restriction preventing all the components, including storage, to reside in one element, such as a client computer." Therefore, Applicants submit that there is support for the language in Fig. 9 regarding "computer with storage", and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102(e)

Claims 47-51, 53-54, 56-58, 60, 62-64, 66 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,904,485 to Siefert. The Advisory Action indicated the rejections were not overcome. In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons presented in the Prior Response. In addition, Applicants submit that Siefert fails to teach or suggest, “resolving the conflict by generating a new rule...”, as recited in independent claims 47, 57 and 63, and new independent claim 70.

Therefore Applicants submit that independent claims 47, 57, 63 and 70 are novel and non-obvious over Siefert. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection to the claims should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants submit that the rejections to the dependent claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the claim from which they depend.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons submitted above, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due to Deposit Account No. 50-0727 (order no. 170 Cont2).

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter P. Tong/

Peter P. Tong
Registration No. 35,757

1807 Limetree Lane
Mountain View, CA 94040
(650) 625-8192